

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

CURTIS LEE ELLIS, #02431084,	§	
	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 6:24-cv-099-JDK-JDL
	§	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
	§	
Respondent.	§	
	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Petitioner Curtis Lee Ellis, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 regarding a federal detainer. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge, the Honorable John D. Love, for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.


On October 15, 2024, Judge Love issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Respondent's motion to dismiss be granted and that this case be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Docket No. 17. A copy of this Report was mailed to Petitioner. No objections to the Report have been filed, and the time period for filing objections has passed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court

examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days). Here, Petitioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 17) as the findings of this Court. Respondent's motion to dismiss (Docket No. 16) is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. All pending motions are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **2nd** day of **December, 2024**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE